arXiv:1703.01077v1 [math.HO] 3 Mar 2017

Pythagorean moulds, fractal moulds on the golden ratio, half-closed-pipe admissible moulds, and the mathematical emergence of the well tempered harmonic semigroup

Maria Bras-Amorós*

March 6, 2017

Abstract

$\mathbb{R}$-moulds of numerical semigroups are defined as increasing sequences of real numbers whose discretizations may give numerical semigroups. The ideal sequence of musical harmonics is an $\mathbb{R}$-mould and discretizing it is equivalent to defining equal temperaments. The number of equal parts of the octave in an equal temperament corresponds to the multiplicity of the related numerical semigroup.

Analyzing the sequence of musical harmonics two important properties of moulds are derived, those of being Pythagorean and fractal. It is demonstrated that, up to normalization, there is only one Pythagorean mould and one non-bisectional fractal mould. Furthermore, it is shown that the unique non-bisectional fractal mould is given by the golden ratio.

The case of half-closed cylindrical pipes imposes to the sequence of musical harmonics one third property, the so-called even-filterability property.

The paper proves that the maximum number of equal divisions of the octave such that the discretizations of the Pythagorean mould and the non-bisectional fractal mould coincide, and such that the discretization is half-closed-pipe admissible is 12. This result gives a mathematical justification for the choice of 12 as the maximum number of equal divisions of the octave in equal temperaments.

Keywords: Harmonic series, equal temperament, numerical semigroup, Pythagorean mould, fractal mould, golden ratio.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 00A65; 20M14

*Email: maria.bras@urv.cat


string
cylindrical open pipe
cylindrical closed pipe
L
L
L
string vibration
motion of the air
motion of the air
$\nu = \nu_0$ $\lambda_0 = 2L$
$\nu_1 = 2\nu_0$ $\lambda_1 = L$
$\nu_2 = 3\nu_0$ $\lambda_2 = 2L/3$
$\nu_3 = 4\nu_0$ $\lambda_3 = L/2$
$\nu_4 = 5\nu_0$ $\lambda_4 = 2L/5$
$\nu_5 = 6\nu_0$ $\lambda_5 = L/3$
$\nu_6 = 7\nu_0$ $\lambda_6 = 2L/7$
$\nu_7 = 8\nu_0$ $\lambda_7 = L/4$
$\nu = \nu_0$ $\lambda_0 = 2L$
$\nu_1 = 2\nu_0$ $\lambda_1 = L$
$\nu_2 = 3\nu_0$ $\lambda_2 = 2L/3$
$\nu_3 = 4\nu_0$ $\lambda_3 = L/2$
$\nu_4 = 5\nu_0$ $\lambda_4 = 2L/5$
$\nu_5 = 6\nu_0$ $\lambda_5 = L/3$
$\nu_6 = 7\nu_0$ $\lambda_6 = 2L/7$
$\nu_7 = 8\nu_0$ $\lambda_7 = L/4$
$\nu = \nu_0$ $\lambda_0 = 4L$
$\nu_1 = 3\nu_0$ $\lambda_1 = 4L/3$
$\nu_2 = 5\nu_0$ $\lambda_2 = 4L/5$
$\nu_3 = 7\nu_0$ $\lambda_3 = 4L/7$
$\nu_4 = 9\nu_0$ $\lambda_4 = 4L/9$
$\nu_5 = 11\nu_0$ $\lambda_5 = 4L/11$
$\nu_6 = 13\nu_0$ $\lambda_6 = 4L/13$
$\nu_7 = 15\nu_0$ $\lambda_7 = 4L/15$

Figure 1: Three models for standing waves and their harmonics

1 Introduction

Acoustics of musical instruments describes how harmonics of a given fundamental tone appear together with the fundamental tone when this one is played. Tones can be thought as wave frequencies and the harmonics of a fundamental tone correspond to integer multiples of that frequency.

Figure 1 illustrates three different models of standing waves. The first one corresponds to the vibration of a string with fixed ends, the second one corresponds to the motion of the air inside a cylindrical pipe with two open ends such as the flute, and the third one corresponds to the motion of the air inside a cylindrical pipe with one open end and one closed end, such as a clarinet or an organ pipe. In the three cases, the first wave represents a fundamental tone and the subsequent waves represent the harmonics associated to the fundamental tone. In the case of the string and the open pipe, the frequencies of the harmonics are all integer multiples of the frequency of the fundamental, while in the case of a pipe with one open end and one closed end, the frequencies of the harmonics are all odd multiples of the frequency of the fundamental.

If one focuses on the case of the string with fixed ends, the notes corresponding to the harmonic

Figure 2: Approximation of the harmonics produced in a string with fixed ends, when translated to the twelve-tone equal temperament.

series of $C2$ are approximately the ones in Figure 2, when translated to the twelve-tone equal temperament. The same sequence appears in cylindrical open pipes.

In the case of cylindrical pipes with one open end and one closed end, only half of these harmonics appear, namely, the ones in Figure 3.

Still in the twelve-tone equal temperament, one can assign the value 0 to $C2$, the value 1 to $C2\#$, the value 2 to $D2$, etc., continuing after 12, assigning 12 to $C3$, assigning 13 to $C3\#$ and so on. Then the sequence of harmonics of $C2$ produced by a string with fixed ends or by a cylindrical open pipe can be represented by

$$H = \{0, 12, 19, 24, 28, 31, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43\} \cup \{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \geqslant 45\}.$$

Notice that one could have used any other pitch rather than $C2$, but $C2$ was used to make the explanation more simple.

The set H is essentially a discretization of a sequence of real numbers given by logarithms. The logarithms, as is vastly known, and as will be expained later, appear when one thinks of the values of notes as their relative interval with respect to the fundamental and when one requires the intervals between notes to behave like a proper distance.

The sequence of real numbers is an ideal model while its discretization is a feasible realization of it. Natural properties of the discretization, in the context of harmonics, are that it must contain 0, it must have only a finite number of gaps, and it has to be closed under addition in the sense that the overtones of an overtone of a fundamental tone should be overtones of that fundamental tone. These three properties are exactly the properties defining a numerical semigroup.

Figure 3: Approximation of the harmonics produced in a pipe with one open end and one closed end, when translated to the twelve-tone equal temperament.

Discretizing the sequence of musical harmonics into numerical semigroups may be seen as defining different equal temperaments. The number of equal parts of the octave in an equal temperament corresponds to the multiplicity of the related numerical semigroup, i.e., its smallest non-zero element. This contribution deals on special ideal sequences of real numbers and their discretizations into numerical semigroups, using a variety of multiplicities.

Natural properties of the sequences of real numbers to be discretized, paralleling what has been said in the previous paragraphs, are that they must contain 0, their elements may be closer and closer as one advances in the sequence, and the sequences must be closed under addition. The sequences satisfying these three properties will be called $\mathbb{R}$-moulds of numerical semigroups.

Let us concentrate on two additional properties that $\mathbb{R}$-moulds can have, which have a translation into the harmonic series. The first one is the Pythagorean property, appearing when one requires intervals between notes to behave like proper distances. Indeed, think of the $\mathbb{R}$-mould as a sequence $\rho_0 = 0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots$, where ρ_i represents the relative pitch of the $(i+1)$th harmonic, with respect to the fundamental tone. Now impose the difference of pitches to behave like a proper distance. By this it is meant, for instance, that the difference between the relative pitch of the fifth harmonic and the relative pitch of the fundamental (which is 0) must be the same as the difference between the relative pitch of the fifth harmonic of the third harmonic and the relative pitch of the third harmonic itself. See Figure 4. Since the frequency of the fifth harmonic is $\nu_4 = 5\nu_0$, the frequency of the third harmonic is $\nu_2 = 3\nu_0$, and the frequency of the fifth harmonic of the third harmonic is $\nu_{14} = 15\nu_0$, this means that $\rho_{14} - \rho_2 = \rho_4$. In general, for any a, b, it is required that $\rho_{ab-1} - \rho_{a-1} = \rho_{b-1}$ or, equivalently, $\rho_{ab-1} = \rho_{a-1} + \rho_{b-1}$.



Figure 4: The difference between the relative pitch of the fifth harmonic and the relative pitch of the fundamental, as marked in the first diagram, must be the same as the difference between the relative pitch of the fifth harmonic of the third harmonic and the relative pitch of the third harmonic itself, as marked in the second diagram.

The second property is that of being fractal. This comes up from the observation that in each next octave in the harmonic series, the intervals appearing in the previous octave are divided always into two parts with the same portions. See Figure 5. Observe that the octave between

the second and fourth harmonics is divided by the third harmonic leaving $7/12$ of the octave on the left and $5/12$ on the right. The two intervals obtained now, $C-G, G-C$, are then repeated within the octave comprised between the fourth and eighth harmonics and subsequently divided approximately also leaving $7/12$ of the interval on the left and $5/12$ of the interval on the right, thus obtaining $C-E, E-G$ and $G-Bb, Bb-C$. Each black note in Figure 5 is a new note that did not appear in any previous octave, and which divides an interval of two notes appearing in the previous octave in the same portions of approximately $7/12$ of the interval on the left and $5/12$ of the interval on the right.



Figure 5: Equal division of intervals. Each black note in the figure is a new note that did not appear in any previous octave, and which divides an interval of two notes appearing in the previous octave in the same portions of approximately $7/12$ of the interval on the left and $5/12$ of the interval on the right.

It will be demonstrated that there is only one Pythagorean $\mathbb{R}$-mould up to normalization, and that there is only one non-bisectional fractal $\mathbb{R}$-mould, up to normalization. Furthermore it will be proved that the unique possible non-bisectional division for fractal moulds is nothing else but the golden portion. The quotien $7/12$ used in the previous paragraph appears to be an approximation of it.

Then it will be shown that the discretizations of the unique Pythagorean $\mathbb{R}$-mould and the unique non-bisectional fractal $\mathbb{R}$-mould coincide while we divide the octave into at most 13 parts (except for 11 parts) or into 18 parts.

The case of cylindrical pipes with one open end and one closed end suggests to analyze the so-called *even-filterable* moulds and *even-filterable* numerical semigroups. For the case of moulds, being even-filterable means that the subsequence of elements with even index is closed under addition. We index the elements of the mould starting by 0, so, when translating to harmonics, this relates to the odd multiples of the fundamental frequency. Since the discretization of a mould into a numerical semigroup collapses at some point, in the sense that two different real elements of the mould map to the same integer element of the numerical semigroup, the property of even-filterability for numerical semigroups is the analogous as for moulds, but taking only their first elements, the ones before collapse.

It will be proved that when dividing the octave into 13 or 18 equal parts, the related numerical semigroups are not even-filterable, while when dividing it into 12 equal parts, it keeps the even-filterability property.

This allows to conclude the paper stating that the maximum number of equal divisions of the octave such that the disrcetization of the Pythagoric mould is simultaneously fractal and half-

closed-pipe-admissible is 12. The resulting numerical semigroup is H and it will be so-called the well tempered semigroup. This gives an alternative justification for the choice of number 12 in the division of the octave into equal parts.

For a mathematical explanation of different stationary waves produced in different instruments and temperaments see [3, 4, 7]. Other references dealing with the number of equal divisions of the octave are [1, 2, 5]. For a general reference on numerical semigroups see [6].

2 Numerical semigroups and $\mathbb{R}$-moulds

A numerical semigroup is a subset S of $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ that satisfies

1. S contains 0,
2. S has finite complement in $\mathbb{N}_0$,
3. S is closed under addition, that is, for any pair $a, b \in S$, the sum $a + b$ belongs to S.

The elements in the complement are called the *gaps* of S and the number of gaps is the *genus* of S, denoted $g(S)$. The smallest non-zero non-gap of S is its *multiplicity*, denoted $m(S)$.

Example 2.1. The set

$$S = \{0, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10\} \cup \{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \geqslant 12\}$$

is a numerical semigroup. Its gaps are $1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 11$ and the parameters just defined are $g(S) = 6$, $m(S) = 4$.

In this contribution a $\mathbb{R}$-*mould* of semigroups is defined as an increasing sequence $M = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots$ of $\mathbb{R}_0^+ := \{r \in \mathbb{R} : r \geqslant 0\}$ such that

1. $\mu_0 = 0$,
2. for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $n_0 \in M$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geqslant n_0$, it holds $\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n < \varepsilon$,
3. M is closed under addition, that is, for any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\mu_k = \mu_i + \mu_j$.

If not otherwise specified, it will be assumed that $\mu_1 = 1$. In this case it is said that the mould is *normalized*. Otherwise the mould is not normalized.

For a normalized mould M define its *i-th period*, denoted $\pi_i(M)$, as the set of elements in M that are at least as large as i and that are strictly smaller than $i + 1$. The *granularity* of M is the cardinality l of the first period.

Example 2.2. The next sequence is a $\mathbb{R}$-mould.

$$\begin{aligned} Q \;=\; & 0, 1, 1 + \frac{1}{4}, 1 + \frac{1}{2}, 1 + \frac{3}{4}, 2, 2 + \frac{1}{8}, 2 + \frac{1}{4}, 2 + \frac{3}{8}, 2 + \frac{1}{2}, 2 + \frac{5}{8}, 2 + \frac{3}{4}, 2 + \frac{7}{8}, \\ & 3, 3 + \frac{1}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{8}, 3 + \frac{3}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{4}, 3 + \frac{5}{16}, 3 + \frac{3}{8}, 3 + \frac{7}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{2}, 3 + \frac{9}{16}, 3 + \frac{5}{8}, \\ & 3 + \frac{11}{16}, 3 + \frac{3}{4}, 3 + \frac{13}{16}, 3 + \frac{7}{8}, 3 + \frac{15}{16}, 4, 4 + \frac{1}{32}, \ldots. \end{aligned}$$

Its granularity is 4. Its first period is $\{1, 1 + \frac{1}{4}, 1 + \frac{1}{2}, 1 + \frac{3}{4}\}$. Its second period is $\{2, 2 + \frac{1}{8}, 2 + \frac{1}{4}, 2 + \frac{3}{8}, 2 + \frac{1}{2}, 2 + \frac{5}{8}, 2 + \frac{3}{4}, 2 + \frac{7}{8}\}$. Its third period is $\{3, 3 + \frac{1}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{8}, 3 + \frac{3}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{4}, 3 + \frac{5}{16}, 3 + \frac{3}{8}, 3 + \frac{7}{16}, 3 + \frac{1}{2}, 3 + \frac{9}{16}, 3 + \frac{5}{8}, 3 + \frac{11}{16}, 3 + \frac{3}{4}, 3 + \frac{13}{16}, 3 + \frac{7}{8}, 3 + \frac{15}{16}\}$, and so on.

Example 2.3. The next sequence is a $\mathbb{R}$-mould.

$$
\begin{aligned}
D \;=\; & 0,\\
& 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9,\\
& 2, 2.01, 2.02, 2.03, 2.04, 2.05, 2.06, 2.07, 2.08, 2.09, 2.10,\\
& 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20,\\
& 2.21, 2.22, 2.23, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30,\\
& 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36, 2.37, 2.38, 2.39, 2.40,\\
& 2.41, 2.42, 2.43, 2.44, 2.45, 2.46, 2.47, 2.48, 2.49, 2.50,\\
& 2.51, 2.52, 2.53, 2.54, 2.55, 2.56, 2.57, 2.58, 2.59, 2.60,\\
& 2.61, 2.62, 2.63, 2.64, 2.65, 2.66, 2.67, 2.68, 2.69, 2.70,\\
& 2.71, 2.72, 2.73, 2.74, 2.75, 2.76, 2.77, 2.78, 2.79, 2.80,\\
& 2.81, 2.82, 2.83, 2.84, 2.85, 2.86, 2.87, 2.88, 2.89, 2.90,\\
& 2.91, 2.92, 2.93, 2.94, 2.95, 2.96, 2.97, 2.98, 2.99,\\
& 3, 3.001, 3.002, 3.003, 3.004, 3.005, 3.006, 3.007, 3.008, 3.009, 3.010,\\
& 3.011, 3.012, 3.013, 3.014, 3.015, 3.016, 3.017, 3.018, 3.019, 3.020,\\
& \vdots\\
& 3, 3.991, 3.992, 3.993, 3.994, 3.995, 3.996, 3.997, 3.998, 3.999,\\
& 4, 4.0001, 4.0002, 4.0003, 4.0004, 4.0005, 4.0006, 4.0007, 4.0008, 4.0009, 4.0010,\\
& \vdots\\
& 4.9991, 4.9992, 4.9993, 4.9994, 4.9995, 4.9996, 4.9997, 4.9998, 4.9999,\\
& 5, 5.00001, 5.00002, 5.00003, 5.00004, 5.00005, 5.00006, 5.00007, 5.00008, 5.00009, 5.00010,\\
& \dots
\end{aligned}
$$

Its granularity is 10 and its ith period has cardinality 10^i.

3 Discretization from $\mathbb{R}$-moulds to numerical semigroups

For a real number r let $[r]$ be its integer rounding by the nearest integer, let $\lfloor r \rfloor$ be its integer floor, and let $\lceil r \rceil$ be its integer ceiling. More generally, given $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 1$, define

$$\lfloor r \rfloor_\alpha = \begin{cases} \lfloor r \rfloor & \text{if } r - \lfloor r \rfloor < \alpha, \\ \lceil r \rceil & otherwise \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor = \lfloor \cdot \rfloor_1$, $\lceil \cdot \rceil = \lfloor \cdot \rfloor_0$, $[\cdot] = \lfloor \cdot \rfloor_{0.5}$.

For a $\mathbb{R}$-mould M and a positive integer m define $[mM] := \{[mr] : r \in M\}$, $\lfloor mM \rfloor := \{\lfloor mr \rfloor : r \in M\}$, $\lceil mM \rceil := \{\lceil mr \rceil : r \in M\}$. More generally, $\lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha := \{\lfloor mr \rfloor_\alpha : r \in M\}$.

The first and second condition, respectively, in the definition of a $\mathbb{R}$-mould imply that $\lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha$ satisfies the first and second condition, respectively, in the definition of a numerical semigroup, for any α. However, the third condition in the definition of a $\mathbb{R}$-mould M does not guarantee in general the third condition for $\lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha$ for a general positive integer m and integer α.

Example 3.1. Take Q as in Example 2.2 and $m = 19$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
19Q &= \{0, 19, 23.75, 28.5, 33.25, 38, 40.375, 42.75, 45.125,\\
&\quad 47.5, 49.875, 52.25, 54.625, 57, 58.1875, 59.375, 60.5625, 61.75, 62.9375,\\
&\quad 64.125, 65.3125, 66.5, 67.6875, 68.875, 70.0625, 71.25, 72.4375, 73.625, 74.8125,\\
&\quad 76, 76.59375, 77.1875, 77.78125, 78.375, 78.96875, 79.5625, 80.15625, 80.75, 81.34375, \dots\}\\
\lceil 19Q \rceil &= \{0, 19, 24, 29, 33, 38, 40, 43, 45, 48, 50, 52, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64,\\
&\quad 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72\} \cup \{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \geqslant 74\}\\
\lfloor 19Q \rfloor &= \{0, 19, 23, 28, 33, 38, 40, 42, 45, 47, 49, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64,\\
&\quad 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74\} \cup \{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \geqslant 76\}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $33, 40 \in [19Q]$, but $33{+}40 = 73 \notin [19Q]$, while $28 \in \lfloor 19Q \rfloor$, but $28{+}28 = 56 \notin \lfloor 19Q \rfloor$. Hence, neither $[19Q]$ nor $\lfloor 19Q \rfloor$ are numerical semigroups.

A normalized $\mathbb{R}$-mould M is said to be *discretizable* by a multiplicity m under rounding, under flooring, under ceiling or, more generally, under rounding by α, if $[mM]$, $\lfloor mM \rfloor$, $\lceil mM \rceil$, or $\lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha$, respectively, is a numerical semigroup. Notice that in all cases, m is the multiplicity of the semigroup. It is easy to check that every normalized mould is discretizable at least by $m = 1$.

Example 3.2. Take Q as in Example 2.2 and $m = 16$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
16Q &= 0, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55,\\
&\quad 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 64.5, 65, 65.5, 66, 66.5, 67, 67.5, 68, 68.5, 69, \dots\}\\
\lceil 16Q \rceil &= \{0, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46\} \cup \{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 : i \geqslant 48\}\\
\lfloor 16Q \rfloor &= [16Q]
\end{aligned}$$

Since both $[16Q]$ and $\lfloor 16Q \rfloor$ are numerical semigroups, Q is discretizable by 16 either by rounding or by flooring.

4 Pythagorean moulds

Let $M = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots$ be a $\mathbb{R}$-mould. It is said that M is Pythagorean if $\mu_{ab-1} = \mu_{a-1} + \mu_{b-1}$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. For a justification of this definition, see the introduction and Figure 4.

Example 4.1. Consider the sequence $L = (\log_2(i+1))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Denote the elements of L in increasing order $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}, \dots$. See next the smallest elements in L, rounding the real values.

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= 0, 1, 1.5849, 2, 2.3219, 2.5849, 2.8073, 3, 3.1699, 3.3219, 3.4594, 3.5849,\\
&\quad 3.7004, 3.8073, 3.9068, 4, 4.0874, 4.1699, 4.2479, 4.3219, 4.3923, 4.4594,\\
&\quad 4.5235, 4.5849, 4.6438, 4.7004, 4.7548, 4.8073, 4.8579, 4.9068, 4.9541, 5,\\
&\quad 5.0443, 5.0874, 5.1292, 5.1699, 5.2094, 5.2479, 5.2854, 5.3219, 5.3575, \dots
\end{aligned}$$

Let us check that L is a Pythagorean $\mathbb{R}$-mould. Recall the well known property of logarithms stating that the logarithm of a product is the sum of logarithms. That is, $\log_b(xy) = \log_b(x) + \log_b(y)$ for any $x, y, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $b > 0$. First of all, one needs to check the three conditions of a $\mathbb{R}$-mould.

1. The first element in L is $\lambda_0 = \log_2(1) = 0$

2. $\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n = \log_2(n+2) - \log_2(n+1) = \log_2(\frac{n+2}{n+1})$. Since the fraction $\frac{n+2}{n+1}$ converges to 1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can take n_0 large enough so that $\frac{n+2}{n+1} < 2^\varepsilon$ for any $n > n_0$. Then $\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n < \varepsilon$ for any $n > n_0$.

3. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has $\lambda_i + \lambda_j = \log_2(i+1) + \log_2(j+1) = \log_2((i+1)(j+1)) = \log_2(ij+i+j+1) = \lambda_{ij+i+j} \in L$.

Now, it remains to see that L is Pythagorean. This follows from the equalities $\lambda_{ab-1} = \log_2(ab) = \log_2(a) + \log_2(b) = \lambda_{a-1} + \lambda_{b-1}$.

Theorem 4.2. *L is the unique Pythagorean normalized mould.*

Proof. Suppose that $M = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots$ is a Pythagorean normalized $\mathbb{R}$-mould, with $\mu_i < \mu_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since M is Pythagorean, $\mu_{ab-1} = \mu_{a-1} + \mu_{b-1}$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\mu_{aa-1} = 2\mu_{a-1}$ for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and, by induction, $\mu_{a^j-1} = j\mu_{a-1}$ for any $a, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Equivalently,

$$\mu_{(a+1)^j-1} \quad = \quad j\mu_a \tag{1}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

It is claimed that $\mu_i = \log_2(i+1)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Suppose that this does not hold for some $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $\mu_i < \log_2(i+1)$ or $\mu_i > \log_2(i+1)$. Suppose first that $\mu_i < \log_2(i+1)$. There exist $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu_i < p/q < \log_2(i+1)$. In particular, $q\mu_i < p$ while $q\log_2(i+1) > p$.

This, together with equality (1) implies that $\mu_{(i+1)^q-1} = q\mu_i < p = p\mu_1 = \mu_{2^p-1}$, while $(i+1)^q - 1 = 2^{q\log_2(i+1)} - 1 > 2^p - 1$, a contradiction since the sequence $\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots$ is supposed to be increasing.

An analogous contradiction is found for the case $\mu_i > \log_2(i+1)$. □

5 Fractal moulds

Let $M = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots$ be a normalized $\mathbb{R}$-mould with granularity l. Consider how the interval from $\mu_0 = 0$ to $\mu_1 = 1$, when replicated from $\mu_1 = 1$ to $\mu_{l+1} = 2$ is divided into l subintervals. Roughly speaking, a mould is said to be fractal if for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for any interval between consecutive elements in the ith period, the same interval appears in the next period (just adding 1 to each end) divided exactly in the same portions as the interval from 1 to 2 is divided in the second period.

Formally, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let l_i be the cardinality of the ith period of M and suppose that

$$\pi_i(M) = \{i + \tau_0^{(i)}, i + \tau_1^{(i)}, \ldots, i + \tau_{l_i-1}^{(i)}\},$$

with $\tau_0^{(i)} = 0 < \tau_1^{(i)} < \tau_2^{(i)} < \cdots < \tau_{l_i-1}^{(i)} < \tau_{l_i}^{(i)} = 1$. It is said that M is fractal if for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\pi_{i+1}(M) = \cup_{r=0}^{r<l_i} \cup_{s=0}^{s<l} \{(i+1) + \tau_r^{(i)} + \tau_s^{(1)}(\tau_{r+1}^{(i)} - \tau_r^{(i)})\}. \tag{2}$$

By this definition it is obvious that for each first period there exists at most one fractal mould, should this construction give a set closed under addition. If this is the case, it is said that the first period *generates* the mould as a fractal mould.

Paralleling the observation in Figure 5, analyze the period $\{1, 1+7/12\}$. If this period generated a fractal mould, this should be

$$\begin{aligned} M &= 0, 1, 1+7/12, 2, 2+(7/12)^2, 2+(7/12), 2+(7/12)+5\cdot 7/12^2, \\ &\quad 3, 3+(7/12)^3, 3+(7/12)^2, 3+(7/12)^2+7^2\cdot 5/12^3, 3+(7/12), \\ &\quad 3+(7/12)+5\cdot 7^2/12^3, 3+(7/12)+5\cdot 7/12^2, 3+(7/12)+5\cdot 7/12^2+5^2\cdot 7/12^3, \ldots \end{aligned}$$

However, this in not an $\mathbb{R}$-mould since it is not closed under addition. Indeed, $2(1+7/12) = 3+2/12 \notin M$. Thus, $\{1, 1+7/12\}$ does not generate a fractal mould.

Example 5.1. The mould in Example 2.3 is a fractal mould.

Example 5.2. The period $\{1, 1.5, 1.75\}$ generates a fractal mould. Its first elements are $0.$, $1.$, 1.5, 1.75, $2.$, 2.25, 2.375, 2.5, 2.625, 2.6875, 2.75, 2.875, 2.9375, $3.$, 3.125, 3.1875, 3.25, 3.3125, 3.34375, 3.375, 3.4375, 3.46875, 3.5, 3.5625, 3.59375, 3.625, 3.65625, 3.671875, 3.6875, 3.71875, 3.734375, 3.75, 3.8125, 3.84375, 3.875, 3.90625, 3.921875, 3.9375, 3.96875, 3.984375, $4.$, 4.0625, 4.09375, 4.125, 4.15625, 4.171875, 4.1875, 4.21875, 4.234375, 4.25, 4.28125, 4.296875, 4.3125, 4.328125, 4.3359375, 4.34375, 4.359375, 4.3671875, 4.375, 4.40625, 4.421875, 4.4375, 4.453125, 4.4609375, 4.46875, 4.484375, 4.4921875, 4.5, 4.53125, 4.546875, 4.5625, 4.578125, 4.5859375, 4.59375, 4.609375, 4.6171875, 4.625, 4.640625, 4.6484375, 4.65625, 4.6640625, 4.66796875, 4.671875, 4.6796875, 4.68359375, 4.6875, 4.703125, 4.7109375, 4.71875, 4.7265625, 4.73046875, 4.734375, 4.7421875, 4.74609375, 4.75, 4.78125, 4.796875, 4.8125, 4.828125, 4.8359375, 4.84375, 4.859375, 4.8671875, 4.875, 4.890625, 4.8984375, 4.90625, 4.9140625, 4.91796875, 4.921875, 4.9296875, 4.93359375, 4.9375, 4.953125, 4.9609375, 4.96875, 4.9765625, 4.98046875, 4.984375, 4.9921875, 4.99609375, $\ldots$

Lemma 5.3. *The cardinality of the ith period of a fractal mould of granularity l is l^i, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

Example 5.4. The mould in Example 4.1 is not fractal. Indeed, since its granularity is 2, for it to be fractal it should satisfy $\frac{\lambda_2-\lambda_1}{\lambda_3-\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_4-\lambda_3}{\lambda_5-\lambda_3}$. In that case one would have $\frac{\log_2(3/2)}{\log_2(4/2)} = \frac{\log_2(5/4)}{\log_2(6/4)}$, implying that $(\log_2(1.5))^2 = \log_2(1.25)$, which is false.

Example 5.5. For any integer $l \geqslant 2$, the period $\{1, 1+1/l, \ldots, 1+(l-1)/l\}$ generates a fractal mould whose ith period is $\pi_i = \{i, 1+1/l^i, 1+2/l^i, \ldots, 1+(l^i-1)/l^i\}$.

The moulds in Example 5.5 are said to be *perfect* fractal moulds. The perfect mould of granularity two is called the *bisectional* fractal mould.

Example 5.6. The mould in Example 2.3 is a perfect fractal mould.

Let $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ be the golden number. The next Theorem is proved in Appendix A.

Theorem 5.7. *1. The period $\{1, \phi\}$ generates a fractal mould.*

2. The unique non-bisectional normalized mould of granularity 2 is exactly the fractal mould generated by $\{1, \phi\}$.

The fractal mould generated by $\{1, \phi\}$ will be denoted F and its terms will be denoted $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \ldots$. The first (rounded) terms are listed below.

$$
\begin{aligned}
F \;=\; & 0, 1, 1.6180, 2, 2.3820, 2.6180, 2.8541, 3, 3.2361, 3.3820, 3.5279, 3.6180, \\
& 3.7639, 3.8541, 3.9443, 4, 4.1459, 4.2361, 4.3262, 4.3820, 4.4721, 4.5279, \\
& 4.5836, 4.6180, 4.7082, 4.7639, 4.8197, 4.8541, 4.9098, 4.9443, 4.9787, 5, \\
& 5.0902, 5.1459, 5.2016, 5.2361, 5.2918, 5.3262, 5.3607, 5.3820, 5.4377, \\
& 5.4721, 5.5066, 5.5279, 5.5623, 5.5836, 5.6049, 5.6180, 5.6738, 5.7082, \\
& 5.7426, 5.7639, 5.7984, 5.8197, 5.8409, 5.8541, 5.8885, 5.9098, 5.9311, \\
& 5.9443, 5.9656, 5.9787, 5.9919, 6, \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

6 Even-filterable moulds and even-filterable numerical semigroups

As explained in the introduction and illustrated in Figure 1 and in Figure 3, cylindrical pipes with one open end and one closed end produce only the harmonics corresponding to odd multiples of the frequency of the fundamental. This suggests defining *even-filterable* moulds as those moulds for which the elements in its sequence with even index form another mould.

Lemma 6.1. *The unique normalized Pythagorean mould is even-filterable.*

Proof. The unique normalized Pythagorean mould is the sequence $L = (\lambda_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0} = (\log_2(i+1))_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. Let $\bar{L} = (\bar{\lambda}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0} = (\lambda_{2i})_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0} = (\log_2(2i+1))_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. Let us check the three conditions of a $\mathbb{R}$-mould.

1. The first element in $\bar{L}$ is $\bar{\lambda}_0 = \log_2(1) = 0$
2. $\bar{\lambda}_{n+1} - \bar{\lambda}_n = \log_2(2n+3) - \log_2(2n+1) = \log_2(\frac{2n+3}{2n+1})$. Since the fraction $\frac{2n+3}{2n+1}$ converges to 1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can take n_0 large enough so that $\frac{2n+3}{2n+1} < 2^{\varepsilon}$ for any $n > n_0$. Then $\bar{\lambda}_{n+1} - \bar{\lambda}_n < \varepsilon$ for any $n > n_0$.
3. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has $\bar{\lambda}_i + \bar{\lambda}_j = \log_2(2i+1) + \log_2(2j+1) = \log_2((2i+1)(2j+1)) = \log_2(4ij + 2i + 2j + 1) = \bar{\lambda}_{2ij+i+j} \in \bar{L}$.

□

However, the unique normalized non-bisectional fractal mould of granularity two is not even-filterable. Indeed, let $\tau = \phi - 1$. Then $\varphi_2 = 1 + \tau$, $\varphi_4 = 2 + \tau^2$, while $\varphi_2 + \varphi_4 = 3 + \tau + \tau^2 = 3 + 1 = 4 = \varphi_{15}$.

The notion of even-filterability for numerical semigroups is a bit more elaborate. For a numerical semigroup S obtained discretizing a given mould $M = \mu_0, \mu_1 \ldots$ by a certain multiplicity m, and a certain rounding parameter α, i.e., $S = \lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha$, we say that its collapse with respect to M, m, α, is the smallest integer κ such that $\kappa = \lfloor m\mu_i \rfloor_\alpha = \lfloor m\mu_{i+1} \rfloor_\alpha$ for some i.

Example 6.2. Consider the unique non-bisectional fractal mould of granularity two F. Discretize it by multiplicity 12 and by flooring. That is,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lfloor 12F \rfloor \;=\; & \lfloor 0.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 12.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 19.4164 \rfloor, \lfloor 24.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 28.5836 \rfloor, \lfloor 31.4164 \rfloor, \lfloor 34.2492 \rfloor, \\
& \lfloor 36.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 38.8328 \rfloor, \lfloor 40.5836 \rfloor, \lfloor 42.3344 \rfloor, \lfloor 43.4164 \rfloor, \lfloor 45.1672 \rfloor, \lfloor 46.2492 \rfloor, \\
& \lfloor 47.3313 \rfloor, \lfloor 48.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 49.7508 \rfloor, \lfloor 50.8328 \rfloor, \lfloor 51.9149 \rfloor, \lfloor 52.5836 \rfloor, \lfloor 53.6656 \rfloor, \\
& \lfloor 54.3344 \rfloor, \lfloor 55.0031 \rfloor, \lfloor 55.4164 \rfloor, \lfloor 56.4984 \rfloor, \lfloor 57.1672 \rfloor, \lfloor 57.8359 \rfloor, \lfloor 58.2492 \rfloor, \\
& \lfloor 58.9180 \rfloor, \lfloor 59.3313 \rfloor, \lfloor 59.7446 \rfloor, \lfloor 60.0000 \rfloor, \lfloor 61.0820 \rfloor, \lfloor 61.7508 \rfloor, \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the obtained semigroup is the semigroup H presented in the introduction. In this case, the collapse is 55, since $\lfloor 12\mu_{22} \rfloor = \lfloor 55.0031 \rfloor = \lfloor 12\mu_{23} \rfloor = \lfloor 55.4164 \rfloor = 55$ and $\lfloor 12\mu_i \rfloor \neq \lfloor 12\mu_{i+1} \rfloor$ for any $i < 22$.

We say that a numerical semigroup $S = \lfloor mM \rfloor_\alpha$ is *even-filterable* with respect to M, m, α if the sum of any two elements in the semigroup with even index is another element in the semigroup which is either at least the collapse or which has even index.

Example 6.3. Let us check that the semigroup H, as a discretization of F by flooring, is even-filterable. Indeed, let us assign subindices to the elements of H as follows: $h_0 = 0$, $h_1 = 12$, $h_2 = 19$, $h_3 = 24$, $h_4 = 28$, $h_5 = 31$, $h_6 = 34$, $h_7 = 36$, $h_8 = 38$, $h_9 = 40$, $h_{10} = 42$, $h_{11} = 43$, $h_{12} = 45$, $h_{13} = 46$, $h_{14} = 47$, $h_{15} = 48$, $h_{16} = 49$, $h_{17} = 50$, $h_{18} = 51$, $h_{19} = 52$, $h_{20} = 53$, $h_{21} = 54$, $h_{22} = 55$, $h_{23} = 56$,...

Now, let us analyze all the sums of two elements with even index. On one hand, $h_0 + h_{2i} = h_{2i}$ for any i. If one of the summands is h_2, the options are $h_2 + h_2 = h_8$, $h_2 + h_4 = h_{14}$, $h_2 + h_6 = h_{20}$, and $h_2 + h_{2i}$, with $2i \geqslant 8$, which is larger than the collapse. For any other pair of summands, $h_{2i} + h_{2j}$, with $2i, 2j \geqslant 4$, the sum is larger than the collapse.

7 Emergence of the well tempered harmonic semigroup

In this section L will denote the unique Pythagorean normalized mould and F will denote the unique non-bisectional normalized fractal mould of granularity two.

Theorem 7.1. *There exists a numerical semigroup of multiplicity m that is simultaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F if and only if $m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18\}$.*

Proof. Let us first give a numerical semigroup of each multiplicity, whenever they exist.

- $\lfloor 1L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 1F \rfloor_{1.00} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 2L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 2F \rfloor_{1.00} = \{0, 2, 3, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 3L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 3F \rfloor_{0.85} = \{0, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 4L \rfloor_{0.28} = \lfloor 4F \rfloor_{0.47} = \{0, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 5L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 5F \rfloor_{0.90} = \{0, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 6L \rfloor_{0.01} = \lfloor 6F \rfloor_{0.41} = \{0, 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 7L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 7F \rfloor_{0.97} = \{0, 7, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 8L \rfloor_{0.35} = \lfloor 8F \rfloor_{0.83} = \{0, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 9L \rfloor_{0.13} = \lfloor 9F \rfloor_{0.56} = \{0, 9, 15, 18, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 10L \rfloor_{0.50} = \lfloor 10F \rfloor_{1.00} = \{0, 10, 16, 20, 23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 12L \rfloor_{0.40} = \lfloor 12F \rfloor_{1.00} = \{0, 12, 19, 24, 28, 31, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, \dots\}$
- $\lfloor 13L \rfloor_{0.18} = \lfloor 13F \rfloor_{0.94} = \{0, 13, 21, 26, 31, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68,$
- $\lfloor 18L \rfloor_{0.05} = \lfloor 18F \rfloor_{0.88} = \{0, 18, 29, 36, 42, 47, 51, 54, 58, 60, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90,$

Let us prove now that there are no α_L, α_F such that $\lfloor 11L \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 11F \rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, and $\lfloor 11L \rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ is a numerical semigroup. Indeed, suppose that, conversely, α_L, α_F satisfy both conditions. Observe that,

$$\begin{array}{ll} 11\lambda_1 = 11 & 11\varphi_1 = 11 \\ 11\lambda_2 = 17.4346 & 11\varphi_2 = 17.7984 \\ 11\lambda_3 = 22 & 11\varphi_3 = 22 \end{array}$$

where the real values have been rounded. The fact that $\lfloor 11L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 11F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ implies that $\lfloor 11\lambda_2\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 17.4346\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ equals $\lfloor 11\varphi_2\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 17.7984\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, which in turn must be either 17 or 18. Since $11\varphi_7 = 33$ and $11\varphi_8 = 35.5967$, we deduce that $17+17 = 34 \notin \lfloor 11F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, and so 17 can not be in the discretization. On the other hand, since

$$\begin{array}{ll} 11\lambda_7 = 33 & 11\varphi_7 = 33 \\ 11\lambda_8 = 34.8692 & 11\varphi_8 = 35.5967 \\ 11\lambda_9 = 36.5412 & 11\varphi_9 = 37.2016 \end{array}$$

we deduce that $18 + 18 = 36$ does not belong to the discretization. So, the discretization is not a numerical semigroup.

Let us prove now that there are no α_L, α_F such that $\lfloor 14L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 14F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, and $\lfloor 14L\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ is a numerical semigroup. Indeed, suppose that, conversely, α_L, α_F satisfy both conditions. Observe that,

$$\begin{array}{ll} 14\lambda_3 = 28 & 14\varphi_3 = 28 \\ 14\lambda_4 = 32.5070 & 14\varphi_4 = 33.3475 \end{array}$$

The fact that $\lfloor 14L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 14F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ implies that $\lfloor 14\lambda_4\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 32.5070\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ equals $\lfloor 14\varphi_4\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 33.3475\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, which in turn must equal 33. This means that $\alpha_F > .3475$. Now, let us consider $\lfloor 14\varphi_2\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 22.6525\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$. It may equal either 22 or 23. But, since $\alpha_F > .3475$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor 14\varphi_7\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 42\rfloor_{\alpha_F} &= 42, \\ \lfloor 14\varphi_8\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 45.3050\rfloor_{\alpha_F} &= 45, \\ \lfloor 14\varphi_9\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 47.3475\rfloor_{\alpha_F} &= 47, \end{aligned}$$

and so, it happens that $2\lfloor 14\varphi_2\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ does not belong to $\lfloor 14F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$. So, $\lfloor 14F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ is not a numerical semigroup.

Let us prove now that there are no α_L, α_F such that $\lfloor 15L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 15F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, and $\lfloor 15L\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ is a numerical semigroup. Indeed, suppose that, conversely, α_L, α_F satisfy both conditions. Observe that,

$$\begin{array}{ll} 15\lambda_3 = 30 & 15\varphi_3 = 30 \\ 15\lambda_4 = 34.8289 & 15\varphi_4 = 35.7295 \end{array}$$

The fact that $\lfloor 15L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 15F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ implies that $\lfloor 15\lambda_4\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 34.8289\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ equals $\lfloor 15\varphi_4\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 35.7295\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, which in turn must equal 35. This means that $\alpha_L \leqslant .8289$ and that $\alpha_F > .7295$. In particular,

$$\lfloor 15\lambda_{20}\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 65.8848\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = 66.$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor 15\varphi_{19}\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 65.7295\rfloor_{\alpha_F} &= 65, \\ \lfloor 15\varphi_{20}\rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 67.0820\rfloor_{\alpha_F} &= 67, \end{aligned}$$

and so 66 belongs to $\lfloor 15L\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ but it does not belong to $\lfloor 15F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, contradicting the hypotheses.

Similar arguments show that for $m = 16, 17$, and for $m > 18$, there are no α_L, α_F such that $\lfloor mL\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor mF\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, and $\lfloor mL\rfloor_{\alpha_L}$ is a numerical semigroup. As an example, for $m = 34$, $34\lambda_4 = 78.9456$ while $34\varphi_4 = 80.9868$. For multiplicities larger than 34, it holds that $m\varphi_3 = m\lambda_3 = 2m$, while $m\varphi_4 > m\lambda_4 + 2 > 2m$. So, to have $\lfloor mL\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor mF\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, one needs $\lfloor m\lambda_4\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor m\varphi_4\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, which is impossible since $m\varphi_4 > m\lambda_4 + 2$. □

Theorem 7.2. *There exists an even-filterable numerical semigroup of multiplicity m that is simultaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F if and only if $m \in \{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,12\}$.*

Proof. First of all, we leave to the reader to check that the numerical semigroups at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 7.1, except for $\lfloor 9L\rfloor_{0.13} = \lfloor 9F\rfloor_{0.56}$, $\lfloor 13L\rfloor_{0.18} = \lfloor 13F\rfloor_{0.94}$, and $\lfloor 18L\rfloor_{0.05} = \lfloor 18F\rfloor_{0.88}$, are even-filterable. The case of flooring of F with multiplicity 12 is shown in Example 6.3, and the other cases can be shown in a similar way.

Let us show now that there is no even-filterable numerical semigroup of multiplicity 9 that is simulaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F. Indeed, suppose that $S = \lfloor 9L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 9F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ is a numerical semigroup for some α_L and some α_F. Let $S = \{s_0 = 0, s_1, s_2, \dots\}$, with $s_i < s_{i+1}$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. By the table in Appendix B, we deduce that s_2 must be either 14 or 15. Since 28 is not in $\lfloor 9F\rfloor_\alpha$ for any α, s_2 must be 15. Then 30 must be in $\lfloor 9F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ and the unique option is $30 = \lfloor 9\lambda_9\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 9\varphi_9\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, which has odd index ans is smaller than the collapse. Then the semigroup can not be even-filterable.

Let us show now that there is no even-filterable numerical semigroup of multiplicity 13 that is simulaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F. Indeed, suppose that $S = \lfloor 13L\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 13F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ is a numerical semigroup for some α_L and some α_F. Let $S = \{s_0 = 0, s_1, s_2, \dots\}$, with $s_i < s_{i+1}$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{array}{ll} 13\lambda_7 = 39 & 13\varphi_7 = 39 \\ 13\lambda_8 = 41.2090 & 13\varphi_8 = 42.0689 \end{array}$$

implies $s_8 = 42$ and so $\alpha_L \leqslant .2090$. This, together with

$$\begin{array}{ll} 13\lambda_9 = 43.1851 & 13\varphi_9 = 43.9656 \\ 13\lambda_{10} = 44.9726 & 13\varphi_{10} = 45.8622 \end{array}$$

implies $s_{10} = 45$ and so $\alpha_F > .8622$. From these bounds on α_L and α_F and the values in Appendix B, we deduce that either

$$\begin{aligned} S \;=\; & \{0, 13, 21, 26, s_4, 34, 37, 39, 42, s_9, 45, 47, s_{12}, 50, 51, 52, s_{16}, 55, 56, \\ & 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, \dots\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} S \;=\; & \{0, 13, 21, 26, s_4, 34, 37, 39, 42, s_9, 45, 47, s_{12}, 50, 51, 52, s_{16}, 55, 56, 57, \\ & 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, \dots\}, \end{aligned}$$

where s_4 is 30 or 31, s_9 is 43 or 44, s_{12} is 48 or 49, s_{16} is 53 or 54.

Suppose first that $s_4 = 30$. Since $13\lambda_4 = 30.1851$, $13\varphi_4 = 30.9656$, this implies $\alpha_L > .1851$ and $\alpha_F > .9656$. Now, $\alpha_L > .1851$ implies that $\lfloor 13\lambda_{20}\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 57.1001\rfloor_{\alpha_L} = 57 \in S$. But $\alpha_F > .9656$, together with

$$\begin{array}{l} 13\varphi_{19} = 56.9656 \\ 13\varphi_{20} = 58.1378 \end{array}$$

implies that $57 \notin \lfloor 13F\rfloor_{\alpha_F}$, a contradiction. Hence, $s_4 = 31$.

Suppose, consequently, that $s_4 = 31$. In particular, $57 = 31 + 26$ needs to be in S and so we discard the case (3). By semigroup properties, $s_9 = 44$, since it equals $13 + 31$.

Suppose that $s_{12} = 48$. Since $13\varphi_{12} = 48.9311$, this implies $\alpha_F > .9311$, which, in turn, implies $s_{16} = \lfloor 13\varphi_{16} \rfloor_{\alpha_F} = \lfloor 53.8967 \rfloor_{\alpha_F} = 53$. So, we get,

$$S = \{0, 13, 21, 26, 31, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, \dots\}.$$

It is easy to check that this semigroup is $\lfloor 13L \rfloor_{.18} = \lfloor 13F \rfloor_{.94}$.

Suppose now that $s_{12} = 49$. Since $13\lambda_{12} = 48.1057$, this implies $\alpha_L \leqslant .1057$, which, in turn, implies $s_{16} = \lfloor 13\lambda_{16} \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 53.1370 \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = 54$. So, we get,

$$S = \{0, 13, 21, 26, 31, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, \dots\}.$$

In this case, the semigroup is $\lfloor 13L \rfloor_{.1} = \lfloor 13F \rfloor_{.89}$.

None of the two previous semigroups are even-filterable numerical semigroups since in both cases $s_2 + s_4 = 21 + 31 = 52 = s_{15}$. So, there is no even-filterable numerical semigroup of multiplicity 13 that is simulaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F.

Let us finally show that there is no even-filterable numerical semigroup of multiplicity 18 that is simulaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F. Indeed, suppose that $S = \lfloor 18L \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 18F \rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ is a numerical semigroup for some α_L and some α_F. Let $S = \{s_0 = 0, s_1, s_2, \dots\}$, with $s_i < s_{i+1}$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. Observe the table in Appendix B, On one hand,

$$\begin{array}{ll} 18\lambda_{15} = 72 & 18\varphi_{15} = 72 \\ 18\lambda_{16} = 73.5743 & 18\varphi_{16} = 74.6262 \\ 18\lambda_{17} = 75.0587 & 18\varphi_{17} = 76.2492 \end{array}$$

implies $\alpha_L \leqslant .0587$. This already implies that the unique option for S is the semigroup $\lfloor 9L \rfloor_{0.13} = \lfloor 9F \rfloor_{0.56}$ given in the proof of Theorem 7.1. Moreover, $\alpha_L \leqslant .0587$ together with the values in Appendix B imply that the collapse of S with respect to L is 90. On the other hand,

$$\begin{array}{ll} 18\lambda_3 = 36 & 18\varphi_3 = 36 \\ 18\lambda_4 = 41.7947 & 18\varphi_4 = 42.8754 \end{array}$$

implies $\alpha_F > .8754$ and this in turn implies that the collapse of S with respect to F is at least 88. Now, S is not an even-filterable numerical semigroup with respect to L, F, since $s_2 + s_8 = 29 + 58 = 87 = s_{27}$ and s_{27} is smaller than the collapse in both cases. □

Let us finally check that the numerical semigroup H in the introduction, which equals $\lfloor 12L \rfloor_{0.40} = \lfloor 12F \rfloor_{1.00}$ in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is, indeed, the unique simultaneous discretization of L and F with multiplicity 12.

Theorem 7.3. *The unique numerical semigroup of multiplicity* 12 *that is simultaneously a discretization of L and a discretization of F is H.*

Proof. Suppose that $S = \lfloor 12L \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 12F \rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ is a numerical semigroup for some α_L and some α_F. Let $S = \{s_0 = 0, s_1, s_2, \dots\}$, with $s_i < s_{i+1}$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. Observe the table in Appendix B. From $s_4 = \lfloor 12\lambda_4 \rfloor_{\alpha_L} = \lfloor 12\varphi_4 \rfloor_{\alpha_F}$ we deduce that $\alpha_L \leqslant .8631$ and that $\alpha_F > .5836$. Consequently, $s_2 = 19$. Now, $38 = 19 + 19$ must be in S and so $\alpha_F > .8328$. From this bound on α_F, the first bound on α_L, and the values in Appendix B, we deduce that $S = H$. □

8 Conclusion

Theorem 7.2 proves that multiplicity 12 gives the largest value for which the discretization of the Pythagorean harmonic sequence keeps the property that every interval is successively divided using the same ratio (in fact, the golden ratio), and also, it satisfies the property of being half-closed-pipe admissible. This gives a mathematical justification for the choice of 12 as the maximum number of equal divisions of the octave in equal temperaments.

Theorem 7.3 shows that the semigroup H is the unique simultaneous discretization of multiplicity 12 of the unique Pythagorean mould and the unique fractal non-bisectional mould of granularity 2. For its importance, H should be given a name and we suggest to call it the well tempered harmonic semigroup.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Alfons Reverté and Pere Casulleras for many helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitivity under grant TIN2016-80250-R and by the Catalan Government under grant 2014 SGR 537.

References

[1] J. M. Barbour. Music and ternary continued fractions. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 55:545–555, 1948.

[2] J. Douthett and R. Krantz. Continued fractions, best measurements, and musical scales and intervals. *J. Math. Music*, 1(1):47–70, 2007.

[3] Rachel W. Hall and Krešimir Josić. The mathematics of musical instruments. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 108(4):347–357, 2001.

[4] Leon Harkleroad. *The math behind the music*. Outlooks. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; Mathematical Association of America, Washington, DC, 2006. With 1 CD-ROM (Windows, Macintosh and UNIX).

[5] Richard Krantz and Jack Douthett. Algorithmic and computational approaches to pure-tone approximations of equal-tempered musical scales. *J. Math. Music*, 5(3):171–194, 2011.

[6] J. C. Rosales and P. A. García-Sánchez. *Numerical semigroups*, volume 20 of *Developments in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2009.

[7] William A. Sethares. *Tuning, Timbre, Spectrum, Scale*. Springer-Verlag, 1999. Reed. 2005.

A Proof of Theorem 5.7

Let $(0,1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < x < 1\}$ and let $[0,1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \leqslant x < 1\}$. Given $p \in (0,1)$, let $q = 1-p$ and define

$$\begin{array}{rccl} f_0: & \{0\} & \to & \mathbb{R} \cap [0,1) \\ & 0 & \mapsto & 0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rccl} f_\ell: & \mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, 2^\ell) & \to & \mathbb{R} \cap [0,1) \\ & n & \mapsto & \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} p f_{\ell-1}(n) & \text{if } n < 2^{\ell-1} \\ p + q f_{\ell-1}(n - 2^{\ell-1}) & \text{if } n \geqslant 2^{\ell-1} \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Notice that f_ℓ depends on the choice of p. Notice also that, if $\ell \geqslant 1$ and $n < 2^{\ell-1}$, then $f_{\ell-1}(n) = f_\ell(2n)$.

Lemma A.1. *If a mould $M = \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots$ is fractal and has first period equal to $\{1, 1+p\}$, then*

- *the elements of M are exactly $\mu_i = \lfloor \log_2(i+1) \rfloor + f_{\lfloor \log_2(i+1) \rfloor}(i + 1 - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(i+1) \rfloor})$,*
- *the ℓth period of F is $\{\ell + f_\ell(0), \ell + f_\ell(1), \ell + f_\ell(2), \ell + f_\ell(3), \ldots, \ell + f_\ell(2^\ell - 1)\}$, with $\ell + f_\ell(0) < \ell + f_\ell(1) < \ell + f_\ell(2) < \ell + f_\ell(3) < \cdots < \ell + f_\ell(2^\ell - 1)$.*

Recall that the golden number is $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. In next lemma we focus in the case where $p = \phi - 1 = \frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = .618033\ldots$. It will be used that, in this case, $p^2 = 1 - p$, $1 = p + p^2$ and $2p = 1 + p^3$.

Lemma A.2. *Let $p = \phi - 1$ and $q = 1 - p$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\ell > 0$, with $n < 2^\ell$, the sum $p + f_\ell(n)$ is one of*

- *$f_{\ell+1}(c)$ for some $i \leqslant c < 2^{\ell+1}$,*
- *$1 + p f_{\ell+1}(d)$ for some $0 \leqslant d < 2^{\ell+1}$.*

Proof. If $\ell = 1$ then n is either 0 or 1 and $p + f_1(0) = p + 0 = p = f_1(1)$, while $p + f_1(1) = p + p = 1 + p^3 = 1 + p f_2(1)$. Suppose that $\ell > 1$ and assume that the lemma is true for $\ell - 1$.

If $n < 2^{\ell-2}$, then $p + f_\ell(n) = p + p f_{\ell-1}(n) = p + p^2 f_{\ell-2}(n) = f_{\ell-1}(n + 2^{\ell-2}) = f_{\ell+1}(2^2 n + 2^\ell)$, with $2^2 n + 2^\ell < 2^{\ell+1}$.

If $2^{\ell-2} \leqslant n < 2^{\ell-1}$, then $p + f_\ell(n) = p + p f_{\ell-1}(n) = p + p^2 + p^3 f_{\ell-2}(n - 2^{\ell-2}) = 1 + p^3 f_{\ell-2}(n - 2^{\ell-2}) = 1 + p f_\ell(n - 2^{\ell-2}) = 1 + p f_{\ell+1}(2n - 2^{\ell-1})$, with $2n - 2^{\ell-1} < 2^{\ell+1}$.

If $n \geqslant 2^{\ell-1}$, then $p + f_\ell(n) = 2p + p^2 f_{\ell-1}(n - 2^{\ell-1}) = 1 + p^3 + p^2 f_{\ell-1}(n - 2^{\ell-1}) = 1 + p^2(p + f_{\ell-1}(n - 2^{\ell-1}))$ with $n - 2^{\ell-1} < 2^{\ell-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, this either equals $1 + p^2 f_\ell(c') = 1 + p f_{\ell+1}(c')$ with $c' < 2^\ell$, and so, with $c' < 2^{\ell+1}$, or $1 + p^2(1 + p f_\ell(d')) = 1 + p(p + p^2 f_\ell(d')) = 1 + p f_{\ell+1}(d' + 2^\ell)$ with $d' < 2^\ell$, and so, with $d' + 2^\ell < 2^{\ell+1}$. □

Lemma A.3. *Let $p = \phi - 1$ and $q = 1 - p$. If $i, j, a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with $0 \leqslant a < 2^i$ and $0 \leqslant b < 2^j$, then $f_i(a) + f_j(b)$ is one of*

- *$f_{i+j}(c)$ for some $0 \leqslant c < 2^{i+j}$,*
- *$1 + f_{i+j+1}(d)$ for some $0 \leqslant d < 2^{i+j+1}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $i + j$. If $i + j$ equals 0 then the result is obvious. Suppose that $i + j > 0$. If one of i and j is 0 then the result is also obvious, so, we can assume that both i and j are non-zero. On one hand, $f_i(a) = pf_{i-1}(a')$ or $f_i(a) = p + qf_{i-1}(a')$ for some $a' < 2^{i-1}$. On the other hand, $f_j(b) = pf_{j-1}(b')$ or $f_j(b) = p + qf_{j-1}(b')$ for some $b' < 2^{j-1}$. So, one of the next cases holds.

1. $f_i(a) + f_j(b) = pf_{i-1}(a') + pf_{j-1}(b') = p(f_{i-1}(a') + f_{j-1}(b'))$ for some $a' < 2^{i-1}$ and some $b' < 2^{j-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, this equals one of

   - $pf_{i+j-2}(c)$ for some $0 \leqslant c < 2^{i+j-2}$,
   - $p(1 + f_{i+j-1}(d))$ for some $0 \leqslant d < 2^{i+j-1}$.

   On one hand, $pf_{i+j-2}(c) = f_{i+j-1}(c) = f_{i+j}(2c)$, with $2c < 2^{i+j}$. On the other hand, $p(1 + f_{i+j-1}(d))$ can be either $p(1 + pf_{i+j-2}(d'))$ or $p(1 + p + qf_{i+j-2}(d'))$ for some $d' < 2^{i+j-2}$. But $p(1 + pf_{i+j-2}(d')) = p + p^2 f_{i+j-2}(d') = f_{i+j-1}(d' + 2^{i+j-2}) = f_{i+j}(2d' + 2^{i+j-1})$ with $2d' + 2^{i+j-1} < 2^{i+j}$, while $p(1+p+qf_{i+j-2}(d')) = p+p^2+p^3 f_{i+j-2}(d') = 1+f_{i+j+1}(d')$, with $d' < 2^{i+j+1}$.

2. $f_i(a) + f_j(b) = pf_{i-1}(a') + p + qf_{j-1}(b')$ for some $a' < 2^{i-1}$ and some $b' < 2^{j-1}$. If $i = 1$, then $a' = 0$ and $f_i(a) + f_j(b) = p + qf_{j-1}(b') = f_j(b' + 2^{j-1}) = f_{i+j}(2^i b' + 2^{i+j-1})$, with $2^i b' + 2^{i+j-1} < 2^{i+j}$. So, we can assume $i > 1$. Now, by the definition of f, the sum $f_i(a)+f_j(b)$ equals one of

   - $p^2 f_{i-2}(a') + p + qf_{j-1}(b') = p + p^2(f_{i-2}(a') + f_{j-1}(b'))$ if $a' < 2^{i-2}$,
   - $p + qf_{i-2}(a' - 2^{i-2}) + p + qf_{j-1}(b') = 2p + p^2(f_{i-2}(a' - 2^{i-2}) + f_{j-1}(b'))$ if $a' \geqslant 2^{i-2}$.

   The first sum, by the induction hypothesis, is either $p + q(f_{i+j-3}(c')) = f_{i+j-2}(c' + 2^{i+j-3}) = f_{i+j}(2^2 c' + 2^{i+j-1})$ with $c' < 2^{i+j-3}$ and so, with $2^2 c' + 2^{i+j-1} < 2^{i+j}$, or $p+q(1+f_{i+j-2}(d')) = 1 + p^2 f_{i+j-2}(d') = 1 + f_{i+j}(d')$, with $d' < 2^{i+j-2} < 2^{i+j}$.

   The second sum, by the induction hypothesis, is either $2p + q(f_{i+j-3}(c'))$ with $c' < 2^{i+j-3}$ or $2p + q(1 + f_{i+j-2}(d'))$ with $d' < 2^{i+j-2}$. On one hand, $2p + q(f_{i+j-3}(c')) = f_1(1) + f_{i+j-2}(c' + 2^{i+j-3})$ with $c' < 2^{i+j-3}$ and so, with $c' + 2^{i+j-3} < 2^{i+j-2}$, and the result follows by induction. On the other hand, $2p+q(1+f_{i+j-2}(d')) = (p+q)+p+qf_{i+j-2}(d') = 1+f_{i+j-1}(d'+2^{i+j-2}) = 1 + f_{i+j+1}(2^2 d' + 2^{i+j})$, with $d' < 2^{i+j-2}$ and so, with $2^2 d' + 2^{i+j} < 2^{i+j+1}$.

3. $f_i(a) + f_j(b) = p + qf_{i-1}(a') + pf_{j-1}(b')$ for some $a' < 2^{i-1}$ and some $b' < 2^{j-1}$. This case can be proved as the previous point.

4. $f_i(a) + f_j(b) = p + qf_{i-1}(a') + p + qf_{j-1}(b') = 2p + q(f_{i-1}(a') + f_{j-1}(b'))$ for some $a' < 2^{i-1}$ and some $b' < 2^{j-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, this equals one of

   - $2p + qf_{i+j-2}(c')$ for some $0 \leqslant c' < 2^{i+j-2}$,
   - $2p + q(1 + f_{i+j-1}(d'))$ for some $0 \leqslant d' < 2^{i+j-1}$.

   On one hand, $2p+qf_{i+j-2}(c') = p+f_{i+j-1}(c'+2^{i+j-2})$ and the result follows by Lemma A.2.

   On the other hand, $2p + q(1 + f_{i+j-1}(d')) = 1 + p + qf_{i+j-1}(d') = 1 + f_{i+j}(d' + 2^{i+j-1}) = 1 + f_{i+j+1}(2d' + 2^{i+j})$ with $2d' + 2^{i+j} < 2^{i+j+1}$.

□

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 5.7.

Proof. 1. One needs to see that, for the case when $p = \phi - 1$, the sequence described in Lemma A.1 is closed under addition. This is a direct consequence of Lemma A.3.

2. Suppose that M is a non-bisectional normalized mould of granularity 2. Then its first period is $\{1, 1+p\}$ for some p with $0 < p < 1$. By Lemma A.1, the second and third periods of the mould must be

$$\{2, 2+p^2, 2+p, 2+2p-p^2\},$$
$$\{3, 3+p^3, 3+p^2, 3+2p^2-p^3, 3+p, 3+p+p^2-p^3, 3+2p-p^2, 3+3p-3p^2+p^3\},$$

where the elements in each period are presented in increasing order.

If M is non-bisectional then $p \neq 0.5$. For M to be closed under addition, it must hold that $(1+p)+(1+p) = 2+2p \in M$.

If $p < 0.5$, then $2+p < 2+2p < 3$. Looking at the elements of the second period, one can deduce that $2+2p = 2+2p-p^2$, leading to $p = 0$, which is out of the range.

Then, p must be larger than 0.5. In this case, $3 < 2+2p < 3+p$. Looking at the elements of the third period, one can deduce that $2+2p$ is either $3+p^3$, $3+p^2$, or $3+2p^2-p^3$. This leads to the equations $p^3-2p+1 = (p^2+p-1)(p-1) = 0$, $p^2-2p+1 = (p-1)^2 = 0$ or $p^3-2p^2+2p-1 = (p^2-p+1)(p-1) = 0$. Among these equations, the unique having a real in range solution is the first one, being the solution $p = \frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = \phi - 1$. Hence, $1+p = \phi$.

□

B Tables

$9\lambda_0 = 0.0000$	$9\varphi_0 = 0.0000$	$11\lambda_0 = 0.0000$	$11\varphi_0 = 0.0000$	$12\lambda_0 = 0.0000$	$12\varphi_0 = 0.0000$	$13\lambda_0 = 0.0000$	$13\varphi_0 = 0.0000$	$18\lambda_0 = 0.0000$	$18\varphi_0 = 0.0000$
$9\lambda_1 = 9.0000$	$9\varphi_1 = 9.0000$	$11\lambda_1 = 11.0000$	$11\varphi_1 = 11.0000$	$12\lambda_1 = 12.0000$	$12\varphi_1 = 12.0000$	$13\lambda_1 = 13.0000$	$13\varphi_1 = 13.0000$	$18\lambda_1 = 18.0000$	$18\varphi_1 = 18.0000$
$9\lambda_2 = 14.2647$	$9\varphi_2 = 14.5623$	$11\lambda_2 = 17.4346$	$11\varphi_2 = 17.7984$	$12\lambda_2 = 19.0196$	$12\varphi_2 = 19.4164$	$13\lambda_2 = 20.6045$	$13\varphi_2 = 21.0344$	$18\lambda_2 = 28.5293$	$18\varphi_2 = 29.1246$
$9\lambda_3 = 18.0000$	$9\varphi_3 = 18.0000$	$11\lambda_3 = 22.0000$	$11\varphi_3 = 22.0000$	$12\lambda_3 = 24.0000$	$12\varphi_3 = 24.0000$	$13\lambda_3 = 26.0000$	$13\varphi_3 = 26.0000$	$18\lambda_3 = 36.0000$	$18\varphi_3 = 36.0000$
$9\lambda_4 = 20.8974$	$9\varphi_4 = 21.4377$	$11\lambda_4 = 25.5412$	$11\varphi_4 = 26.2016$	$12\lambda_4 = 27.8631$	$12\varphi_4 = 28.5836$	$13\lambda_4 = 30.1851$	$13\varphi_4 = 30.9656$	$18\lambda_4 = 41.7947$	$18\varphi_4 = 42.8754$
$9\lambda_5 = 23.2647$	$9\varphi_5 = 23.5623$	$11\lambda_5 = 28.4346$	$11\varphi_5 = 28.7984$	$12\lambda_5 = 31.0196$	$12\varphi_5 = 31.4164$	$13\lambda_5 = 33.6045$	$13\varphi_5 = 34.0344$	$18\lambda_5 = 46.5293$	$18\varphi_5 = 47.1246$
$9\lambda_6 = 25.2662$	$9\varphi_6 = 25.6869$	$11\lambda_6 = 30.8809$	$11\varphi_6 = 31.3951$	$12\lambda_6 = 33.6883$	$12\varphi_6 = 34.2492$	$13\lambda_6 = 36.4956$	$13\varphi_6 = 37.1033$	$18\lambda_6 = 50.5324$	$18\varphi_6 = 51.3738$
$9\lambda_7 = 27.0000$	$9\varphi_7 = 27.0000$	$11\lambda_7 = 33.0000$	$11\varphi_7 = 33.0000$	$12\lambda_7 = 36.0000$	$12\varphi_7 = 36.0000$	$13\lambda_7 = 39.0000$	$13\varphi_7 = 39.0000$	$18\lambda_7 = 54.0000$	$18\varphi_7 = 54.0000$
$9\lambda_8 = 28.5293$	$9\varphi_8 = 29.1246$	$11\lambda_8 = 34.8692$	$11\varphi_8 = 35.5967$	$12\lambda_8 = 38.0391$	$12\varphi_8 = 38.8328$	$13\lambda_8 = 41.2090$	$13\varphi_8 = 42.0689$	$18\lambda_8 = 57.0587$	$18\varphi_8 = 58.2492$
$9\lambda_9 = 29.8974$	$9\varphi_9 = 30.4377$	$11\lambda_9 = 36.5412$	$11\varphi_9 = 37.2016$	$12\lambda_9 = 39.8631$	$12\varphi_9 = 40.5836$	$13\lambda_9 = 43.1851$	$13\varphi_9 = 43.9656$	$18\lambda_9 = 59.7947$	$18\varphi_9 = 60.8754$
$9\lambda_{10} = 31.1349$	$9\varphi_{10} = 31.7508$	$11\lambda_{10} = 38.0537$	$11\varphi_{10} = 38.8065$	$12\lambda_{10} = 41.5132$	$12\varphi_{10} = 42.3344$	$13\lambda_{10} = 44.9726$	$13\varphi_{10} = 45.8622$	$18\lambda_{10} = 62.2698$	$18\varphi_{10} = 63.5016$
$9\lambda_{11} = 32.2647$	$9\varphi_{11} = 32.5623$	$11\lambda_{11} = 39.4346$	$11\varphi_{11} = 39.7984$	$12\lambda_{11} = 43.0196$	$12\varphi_{11} = 43.4164$	$13\lambda_{11} = 46.6045$	$13\varphi_{11} = 47.0344$	$18\lambda_{11} = 64.5293$	$18\varphi_{11} = 65.1246$
$9\lambda_{12} = 33.3040$	$9\varphi_{12} = 33.8754$	$11\lambda_{12} = 40.7048$	$11\varphi_{12} = 41.4033$	$12\lambda_{12} = 44.4053$	$12\varphi_{12} = 45.1672$	$13\lambda_{12} = 48.1057$	$13\varphi_{12} = 48.9311$	$18\lambda_{12} = 66.6079$	$18\varphi_{12} = 67.7508$
$9\lambda_{13} = 34.2662$	$9\varphi_{13} = 34.6869$	$11\lambda_{13} = 41.8809$	$11\varphi_{13} = 42.3951$	$12\lambda_{13} = 45.6883$	$12\varphi_{13} = 46.2492$	$13\lambda_{13} = 49.4956$	$13\varphi_{13} = 50.1033$	$18\lambda_{13} = 68.5324$	$18\varphi_{13} = 69.3738$
$9\lambda_{14} = 35.1620$	$9\varphi_{14} = 35.4984$	$11\lambda_{14} = 42.9758$	$11\varphi_{14} = 43.3870$	$12\lambda_{14} = 46.8827$	$12\varphi_{14} = 47.3313$	$13\lambda_{14} = 50.7896$	$13\varphi_{14} = 51.2755$	$18\lambda_{14} = 70.3240$	$18\varphi_{14} = 70.9969$
$9\lambda_{15} = 36.0000$	$9\varphi_{15} = 36.0000$	$11\lambda_{15} = 44.0000$	$11\varphi_{15} = 44.0000$	$12\lambda_{15} = 48.0000$	$12\varphi_{15} = 48.0000$	$13\lambda_{15} = 52.0000$	$13\varphi_{15} = 52.0000$	$18\lambda_{15} = 72.0000$	$18\varphi_{15} = 72.0000$
$9\lambda_{16} = 36.7872$	$9\varphi_{16} = 37.3131$	$11\lambda_{16} = 44.9621$	$11\varphi_{16} = 45.6049$	$12\lambda_{16} = 49.0496$	$12\varphi_{16} = 49.7508$	$13\lambda_{16} = 53.1370$	$13\varphi_{16} = 53.8967$	$18\lambda_{16} = 73.5743$	$18\varphi_{16} = 74.6262$
$9\lambda_{17} = 37.5293$	$9\varphi_{17} = 38.1246$	$11\lambda_{17} = 45.8692$	$11\varphi_{17} = 46.5967$	$12\lambda_{17} = 50.0391$	$12\varphi_{17} = 50.8328$	$13\lambda_{17} = 54.2090$	$13\varphi_{17} = 55.0689$	$18\lambda_{17} = 75.0587$	$18\varphi_{17} = 76.2492$
$9\lambda_{18} = 38.2313$	$9\varphi_{18} = 38.9361$	$11\lambda_{18} = 46.7272$	$11\varphi_{18} = 47.5886$	$12\lambda_{18} = 50.9751$	$12\varphi_{18} = 51.9149$	$13\lambda_{18} = 55.2231$	$13\varphi_{18} = 56.2411$	$18\lambda_{18} = 76.4627$	$18\varphi_{18} = 77.8723$
$9\lambda_{19} = 38.8974$	$9\varphi_{19} = 39.4377$	$11\lambda_{19} = 47.5412$	$11\varphi_{19} = 48.2016$	$12\lambda_{19} = 51.8631$	$12\varphi_{19} = 52.5836$	$13\lambda_{19} = 56.1851$	$13\varphi_{19} = 56.9656$	$18\lambda_{19} = 77.7947$	$18\varphi_{19} = 78.8754$
$9\lambda_{20} = 39.5309$	$9\varphi_{20} = 40.2492$	$11\lambda_{20} = 48.3155$	$11\varphi_{20} = 49.1935$	$12\lambda_{20} = 52.7078$	$12\varphi_{20} = 53.6656$	$13\lambda_{20} = 57.1001$	$13\varphi_{20} = 58.1378$	$18\lambda_{20} = 79.0617$	$18\varphi_{20} = 80.4984$
$9\lambda_{21} = 40.1349$	$9\varphi_{21} = 40.7508$	$11\lambda_{21} = 49.0537$	$11\varphi_{21} = 49.8065$	$12\lambda_{21} = 53.5132$	$12\varphi_{21} = 54.3344$	$13\lambda_{21} = 57.9726$	$13\varphi_{21} = 58.8622$	$18\lambda_{21} = 80.2698$	$18\varphi_{21} = 81.5016$
$9\lambda_{22} = 40.7121$	$9\varphi_{22} = 41.2523$	$11\lambda_{22} = 49.7592$	$11\varphi_{22} = 50.4195$	$12\lambda_{22} = 54.2827$	$12\varphi_{22} = 55.0031$	$13\lambda_{22} = 58.8063$	$13\varphi_{22} = 59.5867$	$18\lambda_{22} = 81.4241$	$18\varphi_{22} = 82.5047$
$9\lambda_{23} = 41.2647$	$9\varphi_{23} = 41.5623$	$11\lambda_{23} = 50.4346$	$11\varphi_{23} = 50.7984$	$12\lambda_{23} = 55.0196$	$12\varphi_{23} = 55.4164$	$13\lambda_{23} = 59.6045$	$13\varphi_{23} = 60.0344$	$18\lambda_{23} = 82.5293$	$18\varphi_{23} = 83.1246$
$9\lambda_{24} = 41.7947$	$9\varphi_{24} = 42.3738$	$11\lambda_{24} = 51.0824$	$11\varphi_{24} = 51.7902$	$12\lambda_{24} = 55.7263$	$12\varphi_{24} = 56.4984$	$13\lambda_{24} = 60.3701$	$13\varphi_{24} = 61.2067$	$18\lambda_{24} = 83.5894$	$18\varphi_{24} = 84.7477$
$9\lambda_{25} = 42.3040$	$9\varphi_{25} = 42.8754$	$11\lambda_{25} = 51.7048$	$11\varphi_{25} = 52.4033$	$12\lambda_{25} = 56.4053$	$12\varphi_{25} = 57.1672$	$13\lambda_{25} = 61.1057$	$13\varphi_{25} = 61.9311$	$18\lambda_{25} = 84.6079$	$18\varphi_{25} = 85.7508$
$9\lambda_{26} = 42.7940$	$9\varphi_{26} = 43.3769$	$11\lambda_{26} = 52.3038$	$11\varphi_{26} = 53.0163$	$12\lambda_{26} = 57.0587$	$12\varphi_{26} = 57.8359$	$13\lambda_{26} = 61.8135$	$13\varphi_{26} = 62.6556$	$18\lambda_{26} = 85.5880$	$18\varphi_{26} = 86.7539$
$9\lambda_{27} = 43.2662$	$9\varphi_{27} = 43.6869$	$11\lambda_{27} = 52.8809$	$11\varphi_{27} = 53.3951$	$12\lambda_{27} = 57.6883$	$12\varphi_{27} = 58.2492$	$13\lambda_{27} = 62.4956$	$13\varphi_{27} = 63.1033$	$18\lambda_{27} = 86.5324$	$18\varphi_{27} = 87.3738$
$9\lambda_{28} = 43.7218$	$9\varphi_{28} = 44.1885$	$11\lambda_{28} = 53.4378$	$11\varphi_{28} = 54.0081$	$12\lambda_{28} = 58.2958$	$12\varphi_{28} = 58.9180$	$13\lambda_{28} = 63.1538$	$13\varphi_{28} = 63.8278$	$18\lambda_{28} = 87.4437$	$18\varphi_{28} = 88.3769$
$9\lambda_{29} = 44.1620$	$9\varphi_{29} = 44.4984$	$11\lambda_{29} = 53.9758$	$11\varphi_{29} = 54.3870$	$12\lambda_{29} = 58.8827$	$12\varphi_{29} = 59.3313$	$13\lambda_{29} = 63.7896$	$13\varphi_{29} = 64.2755$	$18\lambda_{29} = 88.3240$	$18\varphi_{29} = 88.9969$
$9\lambda_{30} = 44.5878$	$9\varphi_{30} = 44.8084$	$11\lambda_{30} = 54.4962$	$11\varphi_{30} = 54.7659$	$12\lambda_{30} = 59.4504$	$12\varphi_{30} = 59.7446$	$13\lambda_{30} = 64.4046$	$13\varphi_{30} = 64.7233$	$18\lambda_{30} = 89.1755$	$18\varphi_{30} = 89.6168$
$9\lambda_{31} = 45.0000$	$9\varphi_{31} = 45.0000$	$11\lambda_{31} = 55.0000$	$11\varphi_{31} = 55.0000$	$12\lambda_{31} = 60.0000$	$12\varphi_{31} = 60.0000$	$13\lambda_{31} = 65.0000$	$13\varphi_{31} = 65.0000$	$18\lambda_{31} = 90.0000$	$18\varphi_{31} = 90.0000$
$9\lambda_{32} = 45.3995$	$9\varphi_{32} = 45.8115$	$11\lambda_{32} = 55.4883$	$11\varphi_{32} = 55.9919$	$12\lambda_{32} = 60.5327$	$12\varphi_{32} = 61.0820$	$13\lambda_{32} = 65.5771$	$13\varphi_{32} = 66.1722$	$18\lambda_{32} = 90.7991$	$18\varphi_{32} = 91.6231$
$9\lambda_{33} = 45.7872$	$9\varphi_{33} = 46.3131$	$11\lambda_{33} = 55.9621$	$11\varphi_{33} = 56.6049$	$12\lambda_{33} = 61.0496$	$12\varphi_{33} = 61.7508$	$13\lambda_{33} = 66.1370$	$13\varphi_{33} = 66.8967$	$18\lambda_{33} = 91.5743$	$18\varphi_{33} = 92.6262$
$9\lambda_{34} = 46.1635$	$9\varphi_{34} = 46.8146$	$11\lambda_{34} = 56.4221$	$11\varphi_{34} = 57.2179$	$12\lambda_{34} = 61.5514$	$12\varphi_{34} = 62.4195$	$13\lambda_{34} = 66.6807$	$13\varphi_{34} = 67.6211$	$18\lambda_{34} = 92.3271$	$18\varphi_{34} = 93.6293$
$9\lambda_{35} = 46.5293$	$9\varphi_{35} = 47.1246$	$11\lambda_{35} = 56.8692$	$11\varphi_{35} = 57.5967$	$12\lambda_{35} = 62.0391$	$12\varphi_{35} = 62.8328$	$13\lambda_{35} = 67.2090$	$13\varphi_{35} = 68.0689$	$18\lambda_{35} = 93.0587$	$18\varphi_{35} = 94.2492$
$9\lambda_{36} = 46.8851$	$9\varphi_{36} = 47.6262$	$11\lambda_{36} = 57.3040$	$11\varphi_{36} = 58.2098$	$12\lambda_{36} = 62.5134$	$12\varphi_{36} = 63.5016$	$13\lambda_{36} = 67.7229$	$13\varphi_{36} = 68.7933$	$18\lambda_{36} = 93.7702$	$18\varphi_{36} = 95.2523$
$9\lambda_{37} = 47.2313$	$9\varphi_{37} = 47.9361$	$11\lambda_{37} = 57.7272$	$11\varphi_{37} = 58.5886$	$12\lambda_{37} = 62.9751$	$12\varphi_{37} = 63.9149$	$13\lambda_{37} = 68.2231$	$13\varphi_{37} = 69.2411$	$18\lambda_{37} = 94.4627$	$18\varphi_{37} = 95.8723$
$9\lambda_{38} = 47.5686$	$9\varphi_{38} = 48.2461$	$11\lambda_{38} = 58.1394$	$11\varphi_{38} = 58.9675$	$12\lambda_{38} = 63.4248$	$12\varphi_{38} = 64.3282$	$13\lambda_{38} = 68.7102$	$13\varphi_{38} = 69.6888$	$18\lambda_{38} = 95.1372$	$18\varphi_{38} = 96.4922$
$9\lambda_{39} = 47.8974$	$9\varphi_{39} = 48.4377$	$11\lambda_{39} = 58.5412$	$11\varphi_{39} = 59.2016$	$12\lambda_{39} = 63.8631$	$12\varphi_{39} = 64.5836$	$13\lambda_{39} = 69.1851$	$13\varphi_{39} = 69.9656$	$18\lambda_{39} = 95.7947$	$18\varphi_{39} = 96.8754$
$9\lambda_{40} = 48.2180$	$9\varphi_{40} = 48.9392$	$11\lambda_{40} = 58.9331$	$11\varphi_{40} = 59.8146$	$12\lambda_{40} = 64.2906$	$12\varphi_{40} = 65.2523$	$13\lambda_{40} = 69.6482$	$13\varphi_{40} = 70.6900$	$18\lambda_{40} = 96.4359$	$18\varphi_{40} = 97.8785$
$9\lambda_{41} = 48.5309$	$9\varphi_{41} = 49.2492$	$11\lambda_{41} = 59.3155$	$11\varphi_{41} = 60.1935$	$12\lambda_{41} = 64.7078$	$12\varphi_{41} = 65.6656$	$13\lambda_{41} = 70.1001$	$13\varphi_{41} = 71.1378$	$18\lambda_{41} = 97.0617$	$18\varphi_{41} = 98.4984$
$9\lambda_{42} = 48.8364$	$9\varphi_{42} = 49.5592$	$11\lambda_{42} = 59.6889$	$11\varphi_{42} = 60.5724$	$12\lambda_{42} = 65.1152$	$12\varphi_{42} = 66.0789$	$13\lambda_{42} = 70.5414$	$13\varphi_{42} = 71.5855$	$18\lambda_{42} = 97.6728$	$18\varphi_{42} = 99.1184$
$9\lambda_{43} = 49.1349$	$9\varphi_{43} = 49.7508$	$11\lambda_{43} = 60.0537$	$11\varphi_{43} = 60.8065$	$12\lambda_{43} = 65.5132$	$12\varphi_{43} = 66.3344$	$13\lambda_{43} = 70.9726$	$13\varphi_{43} = 71.8622$	$18\lambda_{43} = 98.2698$	$18\varphi_{43} = 99.5016$
$9\lambda_{44} = 49.4267$	$9\varphi_{44} = 50.0608$	$11\lambda_{44} = 60.4104$	$11\varphi_{44} = 61.1854$	$12\lambda_{44} = 65.9022$	$12\varphi_{44} = 66.7477$	$13\lambda_{44} = 71.3941$	$13\varphi_{44} = 72.3100$	$18\lambda_{44} = 98.8534$	$18\varphi_{44} = 100.1215$
$9\lambda_{45} = 49.7121$	$9\varphi_{45} = 50.2523$	$11\lambda_{45} = 60.7592$	$11\varphi_{45} = 61.4195$	$12\lambda_{45} = 66.2827$	$12\varphi_{45} = 67.0031$	$13\lambda_{45} = 71.8063$	$13\varphi_{45} = 72.5867$	$18\lambda_{45} = 99.4241$	$18\varphi_{45} = 100.5047$
$9\lambda_{46} = 49.9913$	$9\varphi_{46} = 50.4439$	$11\lambda_{46} = 61.1005$	$11\varphi_{46} = 61.6537$	$12\lambda_{46} = 66.6551$	$12\varphi_{46} = 67.2585$	$13\lambda_{46} = 72.2097$	$13\varphi_{46} = 72.8634$	$18\lambda_{46} = 99.9826$	$18\varphi_{46} = 100.8878$
$9\lambda_{47} = 50.2647$	$9\varphi_{47} = 50.5623$	$11\lambda_{47} = 61.4346$	$11\varphi_{47} = 61.7984$	$12\lambda_{47} = 67.0196$	$12\varphi_{47} = 67.4164$	$13\lambda_{47} = 72.6045$	$13\varphi_{47} = 73.0344$	$18\lambda_{47} = 100.5293$	$18\varphi_{47} = 101.1246$
$9\lambda_{48} = 50.5324$	$9\varphi_{48} = 51.0639$	$11\lambda_{48} = 61.7618$	$11\varphi_{48} = 62.4114$	$12\lambda_{48} = 67.3765$	$12\varphi_{48} = 68.0851$	$13\lambda_{48} = 72.9912$	$13\varphi_{48} = 73.7589$	$18\lambda_{48} = 101.0648$	$18\varphi_{48} = 102.1277$
$9\lambda_{49} = 50.7947$	$9\varphi_{49} = 51.3738$	$11\lambda_{49} = 62.0824$	$11\varphi_{49} = 62.7902$	$12\lambda_{49} = 67.7263$	$12\varphi_{49} = 68.4984$	$13\lambda_{49} = 73.3701$	$13\varphi_{49} = 74.2067$	$18\lambda_{49} = 101.5894$	$18\varphi_{49} = 102.7477$
$9\lambda_{50} = 51.0518$	$9\varphi_{50} = 51.6838$	$11\lambda_{50} = 62.3967$	$11\varphi_{50} = 63.1691$	$12\lambda_{50} = 68.0691$	$12\varphi_{50} = 68.9117$	$13\lambda_{50} = 73.7415$	$13\varphi_{50} = 74.6544$	$18\lambda_{50} = 102.1037$	$18\varphi_{50} = 103.3676$